



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,831	02/14/2002	Dhinakar Radhakrishnan	020162	1560

23696 7590 01/08/2004

Qualcomm Incorporated  
Patents Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, CA 92121-1714

EXAMINER

ODLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2662

DATE MAILED: 01/08/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/076,831

Applicant(s)

RADHAKRISHNAN ET AL.

Examiner

David Odland

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The following is a response to the amendments filed on 10/14/2003.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1,14 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1 lines 6 and 7 the terms 'and the SIM' should be deleted since this is improper English grammar. Also in claim 16 the period after the term 'MSC' in line 6 should be deleted. Lastly, claim 14 depends on claim 2, which has been cancelled in the present amendments. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1,3-5 and 42, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (USPN 5,537,474), hereafter referred to as Brown.

Art Unit: 2662

Referring to claim 1, Brown discloses a code division multiple access (CDMA) mobile station (MS) (a CDMA compliant subscriber unit (SU) (see column 5 lines 13-38 and figure 2)), comprising:

a radio circuit configured to communicate with a CDMA radio access network (RAN) using CDMA protocol (the SU has circuitry to communicate with a CDMA network (see column 5 lines 13-38 and figure 2)); and

a subscriber circuit configured to communicate with a GSM subscriber identity module (SIM) (the SU also has circuitry to communicate with a subscriber identification unit (SIU) which comprises a SIM (see column 5 lines 13-38 and figure 2)) to permit the MS to authenticate itself with a GSM core infrastructure, whereby use of the CDMA RAN with the GSM core infrastructure is facilitated (the SU communicates with the CDMA network by authenticating itself through the use of the SIU which is a uses a GSM based protocol ((see column 5 lines 13-38 and figure 2)); and the SIM, wherein the SIM is configured to store GSM application file level data (the SIM stores an IMSI, which can be considered 'GSM application file level data' (see column 3 lines 21-67)) and telecom level data (the SIM also stores a secret key, which can be considered 'telecom level data' (see column 1 lines 21-67)), and execute commands (the SIM comprises a microprocessor and memory for executing commands (see figure 1)).

Referring to claim 3, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Brown discloses that the MS reads at least one identifier from the SIM upon engagement of the SIM with the MS (the SU reads an unique identity number from the SIM (see column 5 lines 39-67 and figure 2)).

Referring to claim 4, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Brown discloses that the identifier is an International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) (the identifier is an IMSI number (see column 5 lines 39-67 and figure 2)).

Referring to claim 5, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Brown discloses the IMSI being transmitted by the MS in at least one message (the IMSI is reported to the GSM system (see column 10 lines 8-15)).

Referring to claim 42, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Brown discloses that the SIM is configured to execute commands related to a card holder verification feature (the SIM uses its microprocessor to perform an authentication algorithm see abstract and column 3)).

4. Claims 16-18 and 28-32, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ahn et al. (Publication number 2002/0061745), hereafter referred to as Ahn.

Referring to claim 16, Ahn discloses a method for facilitating the use of a CDMA RAN with a GSM core infrastructure (a CDMA system is used in conjunction with a GSM system (see figure 3 and abstract)), comprising:

engaging a SIM with a CDMA MS (a CDMA mobile terminal has a SIM installed thereto (see abstract and figure 3));

transmitting at least one IMSI stored on the SIM to an MSC using a CDMA RAN (the CDMA terminal transmits the IMSI to the MSC (see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Art Unit: 2662

using the IMSI, authenticating the SIM with a GSM core infrastructure (the IMSI is used to authenticate the SIM of the CDMA terminal with the GSM network (see page 3 paragraphs 0045-0051);

based on the authenticating act, registering the MS with SIM with the MSC (if the authentication is successful and it is determined the user is legitimate, the CDMA terminal is registered with the MSC (see page 3 paragraph 0053-0054)); storing GSM application file level data in the SIM (the SIM stores an IMSI, which can be considered 'GSM application file level data' (see paragraph 0043)); storing telecom level data in the SIM (the SIM stores a RAND and also is used in the storing and transmitting of SMS, which can both be considered 'telecom level data' (see paragraph 0049)); and executing commands by the SIM (the SIM is used to execute authentication algorithms (see paragraph 0049)).

Referring to claim 17, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn discloses transmitting the IMSI in at least one message (the IMSI is transmitted to the MSC (see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Referring to claim 18, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn discloses that the message is a registration message (the IMSI is send to the MSC to in a registration request from the CDMA terminal see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Referring to claim 28, Ahn discloses a system for facilitating the use of a CDMA RAN with a GSM core infrastructure (a CDMA system is used in conjunction with a GSM system (see figure 3 and abstract)), comprising:

an MSC communicating with the CDMA RAN using CDMA protocol (an MSC communicates in a CDMA network using the CDMA protocol (see page 3 paragraphs 0043 and

Art Unit: 2662

0044)), the MSC also communicating with the GSM core infrastructure using GSM protocol (the MSC communicates with the GSM network (see page 3 paragraphs 0043-0045));

at least one MS communicating with the CDMA RAN and having a registration in the GSM core infrastructure (the user CDMA terminal is a GSM service subscriber (see paragraph 0045)); and

at least one SIM detachably engageable with the MS, wherein the SIM is configured to store GSM application file level data (the SIM stores an IMSI, which can be considered 'GSM application file level data' (see paragraph 0043)) and telecom level data (the SIM stores a RAND and also is used in the storing and transmitting of SMS, which can both be considered 'telecom level data' (see paragraph 0049)), execute commands (the SIM is used to execute authentication algorithms (see paragraph 0049)) and

authenticate the MS with the GSM core infrastructure (the CDMA terminal has a SIM card installed thereto and is used to authenticate the terminal (see page 3 paragraphs 0042-0046)).

Referring to claim 29, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn discloses that the MS reads at least one identifier from the SIM upon engagement of the SIM with the MS (the CDMA terminal reads and transmits the IMSI to the MSC (see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Referring to claim 30, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn discloses that the identifier is an International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) (the identifier is an IMSI number (see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Art Unit: 2662

Referring to claim 31, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn discloses transmitting the IMSI in at least one message (the IMSI is transmitted to the MSC (see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Referring to claim 32, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn discloses that the message is a registration message (the IMSI is send to the MSC to in a registration request from the CDMA terminal see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Thomas (USPN 6,014,558), hereafter referred to as Thomas.

Referring to claims 6-8, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not disclose that the messages are registration, origination or page response messages. However, as shown in Thomas it is a well-known standardized process in the art for mobile units to transmit mobile subscriber identity numbers in messages related to registration, origination and paging messages (see column 2 lines 43-65). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to transmit the IMSI number disclosed in Brown in registration, origination and page response messages, as taught in Thomas, because sending such identification numbers



Art Unit: 2662

in these kinds of messages is well known and therefore doing so would reduce developmental costs that would be incurred if an entirely new type of message was to be implemented.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Tiedemann (USPN 5,862,471), hereafter referred to as Tiedemann.

Referring to claim 9, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not disclose that the MS selectively displays at least one service provider name. However, Tiedemann discloses of a system wherein mobile stations display the name of the service provider that is serving the mobile station (see column 2 lines 50-58)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the SU of Brown display the name of the service provider, as taught in Tiedemann, because as Tiedemann points out in column 2 lines 56-58, by knowing the name of the service provider a user can make a more educated estimate of roaming costs. This is particularly beneficial in Brown since the SU in Brown roams between GSM and CDMA networks.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Skog (USPN 5,930,701), hereafter referred to as Skog.

Referring to claim 10, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not disclose that the MS selectively displays at least one mobile directory number. However, Skog discloses a system wherein the mobile stations display directory numbers (see column 8 lines 45-51)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to display directory numbers, as taught in Skog, in the system of Brown because as Skog points out in

Art Unit: 2662

column 8 lines 48-51 displaying the number enables the mobile subscriber to be informed of the calling part directory number associated with an incoming call that was attempted when the mobile station was unreachable. This would make the system of Brown more reliable and versatile in that when the mobile station in Brown is powered-up after being powered down for a period of time the user of the mobile station will know the number of the person who was trying to reach them during the powered-down period.

8. Claim 11, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Maruyama (USPN 5,646,604), hereafter referred to as Maruyama.

Referring to claim 11, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not disclose that the MS permits a user to use the MS only if the user inputs a predetermined verification value to the MS. However, Maruyama discloses a system wherein a user of a mobile unit must insert a personal identification code in order to operate the mobile station (see abstract and column 1 lines 19-57)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the code inserting operation taught in Maruyama, in the system of Brown because doing so would increase the level of security associated with the mobile unit by preventing individuals that do not know the personal identification code from using the mobile unit.

9. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Cassidy et al. (USPN 6,480,725), hereafter referred to as Cassidy.

Referring to claim 12, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not disclose that the MS terminates a call upon removal of the SIM from the MS. However, Cassidy discloses a system comprising mobile stations wherein when SIM cards are removed from the mobile station any call in progress is terminated (see column 5 lines 1-9)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to terminate calls made by the mobile unit in Brown when the SIM is removed, as taught in Cassidy, because doing so would increase security of the system. Namely, since the SIM card is used for encrypting messages communicated by the mobile station, removing the SIM would submit any communications made by the mobile station to possible malicious entities; therefore terminating the call when the SIM is removed will prevent this from occurring.

Referring to claim 13, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not disclose deleting the subscriber information upon removal of the SIM from the MS. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to delete the subscriber's information when the SIM is removed because since the SIM is removed the mobile unit is not being used to make calls and therefore there is no need to retain the subscribers information any longer. Furthermore, retaining the subscribers information requires utilizing memory space in the mobile unit and so deleting this information when its not being used will increase the unused memory capacity of the mobile unit and therefore there will be more memory available for use by other information.

Referring to claim 14, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not disclose that the MS periodically checks for the presence of the SIM in the MS and terminates a call when the MS determines that the SIM is no longer engaged with the MS. However, Cassidy

Art Unit: 2662

discloses of a system wherein a mobile unit periodically checks for the SIM card and terminates calls when the SIM is removed and therefore determined not to be present (see column 4 lines 58-67 and column 5 lines 1-9)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to, in the system of Brown, periodically check for the presence of a SIM and terminating calls when the SIM is not present, as taught in Cassidy, because doing so would increase the security of the Brown system. Namely, since the SIM card is used for encrypting messages communicated by the mobile station, it is important to check and determine if the card is present in order to prevent any communications to be intercepted by possible malicious entities; therefore determining if the SIM is present and terminating the call when the SIM is not present will prevent this from occurring.

10. Claim 15, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown.

Referring to claim 15, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not disclose that the MS uses cdma2000 principles. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the already existing cdma2000 protocol in the system of Brown because doing so would decrease development costs since an entirely new protocol would not have to be used to implement the system of Brown.

11. Claims 19,20,33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahn in view of Thomas.

Referring to claims 19, 20, 33 and 34, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not disclose that the messages are origination or page response messages. However, as

Art Unit: 2662

shown in Thomas it is a well-known standardized process in the art for mobile units to transmit mobile subscriber identity numbers in messages related to origination and paging messages (see column 2 lines 43-65). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to transmit the IMSI number disclosed in Ahn in origination and page response messages, as taught in Thomas, because sending such identification numbers in these kinds of messages is well-known and therefore doing so would reduce developmental costs that would be incurred if an entirely new type of message was to be implemented.

12. Claims 21 and 35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahn in view of Tiedemann.

Referring to claims 21 and 35, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not disclose that the MS selectively displays at least one service provider name. However, Tiedemann discloses of a system wherein mobile stations display the name of the service provider that is serving the mobile station (see column 2 lines 50-58)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the CDMA terminal of Ahn display the name of the service provider, as taught in Tiedemann, because as Tiedemann points out in column 2 lines 56-58, by knowing the name of the service provider a user can make a more educated estimate of roaming costs. This is particularly beneficial in Ahn since the CDMA terminal in Ahn roams between GSM and CDMA networks.

13. Claims 22 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahn in view of Skog.

Art Unit: 2662

Referring to claims 22 and 36, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not disclose that the MS selectively displays at least one mobile directory number. However, Skog discloses a system wherein the mobile stations display directory numbers (see column 8 lines 45-51)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to display directory numbers, as taught in Skog, in the system of Ahn because, as Skog points out in column 8 lines 48-51, displaying the number enables the mobile subscriber to be informed of the calling part directory number associated with an incoming call that was attempted when the mobile station was unreachable. This would make the system of Ahn more reliable and versatile in that when the CDMA terminal in Ahn is powered-up after being powered down for a period of time the user of the mobile station will know the number of the person who was trying to reach them during the powered-down period.

14. Claims 23 and 37, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahn in view of Maruyama.

Referring to claims 23 and 37, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not disclose that the MS permits a user to use the MS only if the user inputs a predetermined verification value to the MS. However, Maruyama discloses a system wherein a user of a mobile unit must insert a personal identification code in order to operate the mobile station (see abstract and column 1 lines 19-57)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the code inserting operation taught in Maruyama, in the system of Ahn because doing so would increase the level of security associated with the CDMA terminal

Art Unit: 2662

by preventing individuals that do not know the personal identification code from using the mobile unit.

15. Claims 24-26 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahn in view of Cassidy.

Referring to claims 24 and 38, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not disclose that the MS terminates a call upon removal of the SIM from the MS. However, Cassidy discloses a system comprising mobile stations wherein when SIM cards are removed from the mobile station any call in progress is terminated (see column 5 lines 1-9)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to terminate calls made by the CDMA terminal in Ahn when the SIM is removed, as taught in Cassidy, because doing so would increase security of the system. Namely, since the SIM card is used for encrypting messages communicated by the CDMA terminal, removing the SIM would submit any communications made by the mobile station to interception by possible malicious entities; therefore terminating the call when the SIM is removed will prevent this from occurring.

Referring to claims 25 and 39, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not disclose deleting the subscriber information upon removal of the SIM from the MS. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to delete the subscribers information when the SIM is removed because since the SIM is removed the mobile unit is not being used to make calls and therefore there is no need to retain the subscribers information any longer. Furthermore, retaining the subscribers information requires utilizing memory space in the mobile unit and so deleting this information when its not being used will

Art Unit: 2662

increase the unused memory capacity of the mobile unit and therefore there will be more memory available for use by other information.

Referring to claims 26 and 40, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not disclose that the MS periodically checks for the presence of the SIM in the MS and terminates a call when the MS determines that the SIM is no longer engaged with the MS. However, Cassidy discloses of a system wherein a mobile unit periodically checks for the SIM card and terminates calls when the SIM is removed and therefore determined not to be present (see column 4 lines 58-67 and column 5 lines 1-9)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to, in the system of Ahn, periodically check for the presence of a SIM and terminating calls when the SIM is not present, as taught in Cassidy, because doing so would increase the security of the Ahn system. Namely, since the SIM card is used for encrypting messages communicated by the mobile station, it is important to check and determine if the card is present in order to prevent any communications to be intercepted by possible malicious entities; therefore determining if the SIM is present and terminating the call when the SIM is not present will prevent this from occurring.

16. Claims 27 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahn.

Referring to claims 27 and 41, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not disclose that the MS uses cdma2000 principles. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the already existing cdma2000 protocol in the system of Ahn because doing so would decrease development costs since an entirely new protocol would not have to be used to implement the system of Ahn.



17. Claims 43-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Kolev et al. (USPN 5,884,168), hereafter referred to as Kolev.

Referring to claims 43-50, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not disclose that the GSM application file level data comprises language preferences of an MS user, a service provider of an MS user, an accumulated call meter of an MS user, a service table indicating allocated services, a SIM/MS association, a price per unit/currency table. Brown also does not disclose that the SIM also stores a broadcast message identifier or a broadcast control channel designation. However, Kolev discloses a GSM system wherein a SIM card stores all of the above listed values (see the column entitled 'SIM EF' in Table 1 that is located in column 8 lines 5-49)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to store such information in the Brown system because doing so would make Brown more user-friendly, reliable, flexible, secure and efficient. Note, the 'group ID level' values listed in Table 1 of Kolev correspond to the SIM/MS associations as recited in claim 47 and described in the specification.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

18. Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 10 paragraph 3, the Applicant contends that neither Brown nor Ahn disclose a SIM that store GSM application level data and telecom level data and execute commands as required by the newly recited amendments made to the claims. The Examiner respectfully

Art Unit: 2662

disagrees. As shown in the above rejections, Brown discloses an IMSI and secret key and Ahn discloses an IMSI and RAND and SMS stored by the SIMS. These values can be considered 'GSM application level data' and 'telecom level data'. Furthermore both references disclose that both of the SIM's comprise processors for executing instructions, as also discussed above.

### *Conclusion*

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Odland, who can be reached at (703) 305-3231 on Monday – Friday during the hours of 8am to 5pm.

Art Unit: 2662

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached at (703) 305-4744. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist, who can be reached at (703) 305-4750.

deo

January 4, 2004

  
HASSAN KIZOU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600